



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,097	07/31/2001	Ron J. Hudson	108.0004-00000	6784
22882	7590	08/27/2009	EXAMINER	
MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP 1557 LAKE O'PINES STREET, NE HARTVILLE, OH 44632			CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2421	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,097

Applicant(s)

HUDSON ET AL.

Examiner

SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY

Art Unit

2421

Period for Reply
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 and 59-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 and 59-94 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C2)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/22/09 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. (a) Applicant argues that "In Rodriguez, there is no teaching or suggestion at least for continuing the delivery of the video from the point in time when the interruption occurs" on pages 16-17 of the Remarks.

Krapf was cited for teaching continuing the delivery of the video from the point in time when the interruption occurs (col. 4, lines 54-65). Rodriguez was cited to teach interrupting transmission of the video at the server so that transmission of the video is prevented. In this Office Action, the Examiner has brought in Armstrong (7017173). Armstrong teaches that transmission of a primary video from the server is halted while the user views supplemental content, and once the user finishes viewing supplemental content, the transmission of the primary video stream is resumed from the point where it

was last left off before interruption (col. 2, line 62 –col. 3, line 3, col. 3, lines 35-39, col. 7, lines 50-54, col. 14, lines 9-16).

(b) Applicant argues that the Examiner did not reject dependent claims 66-70 on page 15, 3rd paragraph of the Remarks.

Although the Examiner did not reject claims 66-70 in the previous Office Action, the limitations of those claims were rejected in similar corresponding claims. In this Office Action, the Examiner has explicitly rejected claim 66-70.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-21, 23, 25-33, 35, 37-42, 66-67, 71-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf (6483986) in view of Armstrong (7017173).

As for claims 1 and 31, Krapf discloses a method for using an interactive video, the method comprising the steps of:

Delivering the video (12 - Fig. 1) and displaying the video on a visual display for a user (4 - Fig. 1), the video having at least one embedded interface link (alternative

subject matter data 14 – Fig. 1) associated therewith, the interface link adapted to be displayed on the visual display and being linked to ancillary content (alternative subject matter data) accessible over the network (A video and alternative subject matter data is displayed on the same screen as shown in Fig. 1. The viewer selects the alternative subject matter data by pressing a select button on the remote control which links the viewer to begin exploring the alternative subject matter - col. 3, lines 44-56);

interacting with the interface link to access the ancillary content - col. 4, lines 4-14;

interrupting the delivery of the video at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link – (The delivery of the video is interrupted. -col. 4, lines 39-42);

delivering the ancillary content and displaying the ancillary content on the visual display – col. 4, lines 39-42; and

continuing the delivery of the video to the client application from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted/paused after the interacting with the interface link – col. 4, lines 54-65.

However, Krapf fails to disclose:

interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network;

transmitting, a request for ancillary content over the network to a remote site where the ancillary content is stored;

continuing the delivery of the video over the network from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted after interaction with the display;

In an analogous art, Armstrong teaches:

Interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network; transmitting, a request for ancillary content over the network to a remote site where the ancillary content is stored; and continuing the delivery of the video over the network from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted after interaction with the display; (Armstrong teaches that transmission of a primary video from the server is halted while the user views supplemental content, and once the user finishes viewing supplemental content, the transmission of the primary video stream is resumed from the point where it was last left off before interruption. Armstrong further teaches that when a pause command is sent to the server, supplemental content is displayed. The Examiner is interpreting the pause command sent to the server as a request for ancillary content since ancillary content is displayed when the server receives the pause command. col. 2, line 62-col. 3, line 3, col. 3, lines 35-39, col. 7, lines 50-54, col. 14, lines 9-16);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Armstrong, for the advantage of conserving memory and processing power at the receiver end by having the server resume the video from the point where it was last left off, and to provide an interactive system in which related supplemental content is displayed when requested, thereby providing effective advertising to viewers by advertisers and for possibly increasing the advertiser's revenue.

As for claims 2 and 32, Krapf discloses wherein said displaying step includes streaming video over a network to the visual display – col. 3, lines 65-67, col. 4, lines 1-3, col. 6, lines 16-18.

As for claim 3, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes interacting with an interface link that is embedded in the video – (The streaming video data transmitted by the broadcast headend includes the alternative subject matter data. Hence, the alternative subject matter data is embedded in the video – col. 6, lines 38-43).

As for claim 4, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes overlaying the interface link on the video on the visual display – (Referring to Fig. 1, the alternative subject matter is overlaid on the video - col. 4, lines 4-15).

As for claims 5 and 20, Krapf discloses wherein the video is received from a cable headend and the interface link (web page) is received from a web server such that the user could access web data pertinent to the video programming via a modem (col. 8, lines 39-41; fig. 4).

As for claims 6, 21 and 33, Krapf discloses wherein the interface link (web location) is hidden from view until the viewer selects the image, resulting in invoking a linked URL which leads to a web location which provides information related to the image (col. 3, lines 43-56).

As for claims 8, 23 and 35, Krapf discloses wherein different entities in a frame may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to the particular web page (primary ancillary content) when the image is selected. The user browses the particular web page which has links on it and then further accesses a link on the web page by selecting it. The link takes the user to a secondary web page (second ancillary content) which allows the user to access additional desired information— col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claims 10, 25 and 37, Armstrong discloses wherein the user may buy (commercial transaction) a dealer's product through the web page for the advantage of allowing the user to purchase desired goods from his TV set— col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claims 11, 26 and 38, Krapf discloses wherein the user may purchase good or services. As this is possible, the system inherently has a link to a site adapted to transact the commercial transaction for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor — col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claims 12 and 39, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including information relating to the video (The alternative subject matter data is associated with the program of the channel - col. 6, lines 39-42).

As for claims 13 and 40, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including video (The streaming video data includes the alternative subject matter (ancillary content) - col. 6, lines 36-40. The alternative subject matter is saved as compressed video - col. 7, lines 4-9).

As for claims 14, 29 and 41, Krapf discloses the user may purchase a product using the ancillary content for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claims 15, 30 and 42, Krapf discloses the video may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to a plurality of web sites – col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claim 16, Krapf discloses a method for using an interactive video, the method comprising:

Delivering the video (12 – Fig. 1) from a remote location (2 – Fig. 1; col. 6, lines 24-36) over a network (28 – Fig. 1) and displaying the video on the visual display for a user, the video having at least one interface link (18 – Fig. 1) associated therewith

adapted to be displayed on the visual display and being linked to ancillary content (alternative subject matter data) accessible over a network (The viewer selects the alternative subject matter data by pressing a select button on the remote control which links the viewer to begin exploring the alternative subject matter - col. 3, lines 44-56);

interacting with the interface link to access the ancillary content - col. 4, lines 4-14;

interrupting the delivery of the video from the remote location over the network to the client application and pausing the display of the video on the visual display at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link – (The delivering and displaying of the video is paused from the personal video recorder 2 to the display 4. - col. 4, lines 27-42);

accessing the ancillary content and displaying the ancillary content on the visual display— col. 4, lines 39-42; and

continuing the delivery and display of the video from the remote location over the network and continuing the display of the video on the visual display from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted after the interacting with the interface link – col. 4, lines 54-65.

However, Krapf fails to disclose:

Interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network;

In an analogous art, Armstrong teaches:

Interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network (Armstrong teaches that transmission of a primary video from the server is halted while the user views supplemental content, and once the user finishes viewing supplemental content, the transmission of the primary video stream is resumed from the point where it was last left off before interruption. col. 2, line 62-col. 3, line 3, col. 3, lines 35-39, col. 7, lines 50-54, col. 14, lines 9-16);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Armstrong, for the advantage of conserving memory and processing power at the receiver end by having the server resume the video from the point where it was last left off at.

As for claim 17, Krapf discloses wherein said displaying step includes streaming video over a network to the visual display – col. 3, lines 65-67, col. 4, lines 1-3, col. 6, lines 16-18.

As for claim 18, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes interacting with an interface link that is embedded in the video – (The streaming video data transmitted by the broadcast headend includes the alternative subject matter data. Hence, the alternative subject matter data is embedded in the video – col. 6, lines 38-43).

As for claim 19, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes overlaying the interface link on the video on the visual display – (Referring to Fig. 1, the alternative subject matter is overlaid on the video - col. 4, lines 4-15).

As for claim 27, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including information relating to the video (The alternative subject matter data is associated with the program of the channel - col. 6, lines 39-42).

As for claims 28, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including video (The streaming video data includes the alternative subject matter (ancillary content) - col. 6, lines 36-40. The alternative subject matter is saved as compressed video - col. 7, lines 4-9).

Claims 66 and 67 contains the limitations of claim 1 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claims 71 and 79, Krapf teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for claims 72 and 80, Krapf teaches wherein the network is an internet protocol based network (col. 1, lines 21-22, col. 8, lines 39-41).

As for claims 73, 74, 81, and 82, Krapf teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 6, lines 8-38, col. 8, lines 38-42).

As for claim 75, Krapf teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for claim 76, Krapf teaches wherein the network is an internet protocol based network (col. 1, lines 21-22, col. 39-41).

As for claims 77-78, Krapf teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 6, lines 8-38, col. 8, lines 38-42).

5. Claims 55-56, 59-63, 69-70, and 87-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Armstrong.

As for claim 55, Kikinis discloses a method for conducting commerce over a network during the display of a video to a user, the method comprising the steps of:

delivering the video (advertisement) from a remote site (the advertisement is received from a variety of remote sites including a satellite link and a cable TV line – col. 5, lines 33-36) and displaying the video on a visual display (51, 53 – Fig. 1), the video

having an interface link (URL link) associated therewith, the interface link being linked to a commerce site adapted to conduct commerce with the user that is accessible over the network (e.g. In the BMW advertisement, the different entities in the frame are associated with different URLs, and direct the user to different data locations on the same home page. On the web site, a user may conduct a commercial transaction – col. 7, lines 1-17, col. 8, lines 35-38, col. 9, lines 15-24);

interacting with the interface link during the display of the video – (The user may access the web page to conduct a commercial transaction, e.g., purchase sports tickets or car dealer's product – col. 8, lines 30-38, col. 9, lines 15-24);

interrupting (display is suspended) the delivery of the video at the remote site at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link (col. 8, lines 1-10)

accessing the commerce site – (In order to purchase something, the user must be able to access the commerce site - col. 8, lines 23-38, col. 9, lines 9-24); and

displaying the commerce site on the visual display – (In order to purchase something, the user must be able to view the commerce site - col. 8, lines 30-38, col. 9, lines 9-24) .

However, Kikinis fails to disclose:

interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network;

continuing the delivery of the video from the remote site from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted after the accessing of the alternative content;

In an analogous art, Armstrong teaches:

Interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network (Armstrong teaches that transmission of a primary video from the server is halted while the user views supplemental content, and once the user finishes viewing supplemental content, the transmission of the primary video stream is resumed from the point where it was last left off before interruption. col. 2, line 62-col. 3, line 3, col. 3, lines 35-39, col. 7, lines 50-54, col. 14, lines 9-16);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Armstrong, for the advantage of conserving memory and processing power at the receiver end by having the server resume the video from the point where it was last left off.

As for claim 56, Kikinis discloses the step of completing a transaction with the commerce site (As discussed above in claim 55, if the user purchases something, then the user must complete a transaction with the commerce site).

As for claim 59, Kikinis discloses a method for creating an interactive video, the method comprising the steps of:

Encoding and storing the video onto a remote storage medium (memory at the headend) at a first site (headend) – (The STB decodes the data it receives, hence the

data is encoded at the headend prior to transmitting it to the STB where it is decoded— col. 5, lines 33-41. Data is recorded (saved) at the headend – col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-8);

Interrupting (TV display is suspended) the delivery of video from the remote storage medium to a client application accessible by a user at a second site (client site) and providing access to ancillary content accessible over a network, (Once the user selects an entity on the advertisement, the TV display is suspended, the system executes browser routines, and accesses the WWW to retrieve the selected information (ancillary content) - col. 7, lines 48-67).

delivering the video to the visual display – col. 8, lines 1-20; and

delivering the link program (The advertisement is pre-recorded at the headend where data is recorded to be transmitted between frames identifying the position and extent of an object in the adjacent frame, and associating the object with a specific URL. - col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-10).

displaying the video on the visual display – col. 8, lines 1-20.

Interrupting the delivery of the video in response to interacting with the link program (col. 8, lines 1-10)

However, Kikinis fails to teach:

associating the link program with the video;

Interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network;

Continuing the delivery of the video over the network from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted.

In an analogous art, Armstrong teaches:

Interrupting the transmission of the video at the remote location so as to prevent delivery of the video over the network and continuing the delivery of the video over the network from the point in time when the delivery of the video was interrupted (Armstrong teaches that transmission of a primary video from the server is halted while the user views supplemental content, and once the user finishes viewing supplemental content, the transmission of the primary video stream is resumed from the point where it was last left off before interruption. col. 2, line 62-col. 3, line 3, col. 3, lines 35-39, col. 7, lines 50-54, col. 14, lines 9-16). Armstrong further teaches associating the link program with the video (Since the system allows the user to resume playback where last left off, there is a link program);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Kikinis' invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Armstrong, for the advantage of conserving memory and processing power at the receiver end by having the server resume the video from the point where it was last left off.

As for claim 60, Kikinis discloses wherein said associating step includes encoding the link program with the video onto the storage medium – (The advertisement is pre-recorded at the headend where data is recorded to be transmitted between

frames identifying the position and extent of an object in the adjacent frame, and associating the object with a specific URL. - col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-10).

As for claim 61, Kikinis discloses wherein encoding of the link program is performed simultaneously with said step of encoding the video – (As discussed above in claim 60, since the data associating the object with a specific URL is pre-recorded with the video at the headend, the link program is simultaneously encoded with the video).

As for claim 62, Kikinis discloses wherein the video is received from a cable TV link and/or satellite link – col. 5, lines 33-36, and the link program originates from a web server such that the user could access web data pertinent to the video programming via telephone modem (35) or ISDN (39)– col. 5, lines 55-60, col. 7, lines 60-67, col. 8, lines 1-5.

As for claim 63, Kikinis discloses wherein said delivering step includes the sub-step of overlaying the video with the link program during said displaying step – col. 7, lines 48-67.

Claim 69 contains the limitations of claim 55 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 70 contains the limitations of claim 59 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claim 87, Kikinis teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 7, lines 58-67).

As for claim 88, Kikinis teaches wherein the network is an internet protocol based network (col. 7, lines 16-27).

As for claims 89-90, Kikinis teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 5, lines 17-41).

As for claim 91, Kikinis teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 7, lines 58-67).

As for claim 92, Kikinis teaches wherein the network is an internet protocol based network (col. 7, lines 16-27).

As for claims 93-94, Kikinis teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 5, lines 17-41).

6. Claims 7 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong as applied to claim 1 and 31 respectively, above, and further in view of Call (6154738).

As for claims 7 and 34, Krapf and Armstrong fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying the interface link being at least a partially transparent graphic.

In an analogous art, Call discloses wherein a transparent graphic is displayed to indicate to the user a particular message – col. 19, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong's system to include wherein partially transparent graphics are displayed, as taught by Call, for the advantage of indicating a particular message to the user.

7. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Call (6154738).

As for claim 22, Krapf and Armstrong fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying the interface link being at least a partially transparent graphic.

In an analogous art, Call discloses wherein a transparent graphic is displayed to indicate to the user a particular message – col. 19, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong's system to include wherein partially transparent graphics are displayed, as taught by Call, for the advantage of indicating a particular message to the user.

8. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong, and Butler as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of Call (6154738).

As for claim 46, Krapf and Armstrong, and Butler fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying the interface link being at least a partially transparent graphic.

In an analogous art, Call discloses wherein a transparent graphic is displayed to indicate to the user a particular message – col. 19, lines 40-50.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong, and Butler's system to include wherein partially transparent graphics are displayed, as taught by Call, for the advantage of indicating a particular message to the user.

9. Claims 9 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong as applied to claims 1 and 31 above, respectively, and further in view of Alonso (6184878).

As for claims 9 and 36, Krapf and Armstrong fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying an interface link that provides the appearance of moving across the screen of the visual display as the video is being played.

In an analogous art, Alonso discloses wherein moving images are displayed such that the subscriber may dynamically interact it – col. 7, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong's system to include wherein moving images are displayed, as taught by Alonso, for the advantage of allowing the subscriber to dynamically interact with it.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Alonso (6184878).

As for claim 24, Krapf and Armstrong fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying an interface link that provides the appearance of moving across the screen of the visual display as the video is being played.

In an analogous art, Alonso discloses wherein moving images are displayed such that the subscriber may dynamically interact it – col. 7, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong's system to include wherein moving images are displayed, as taught by Alonso, for the advantage of allowing the subscriber to dynamically interact with it.

11. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong, and Butler, as applied to claim 43 above, and further in view of Alonso (6184878).

As for claim 48, Krapf and Armstrong, and Butler fail to disclose wherein said displaying step includes displaying an interface link that provides the appearance of moving across the screen of the visual display as the video is being displayed.

In an analogous art, Alonso discloses wherein moving images are displayed such that the subscriber may dynamically interact it – col. 7, lines 25-35.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong, and Butler's system to include wherein moving images are displayed, as taught by Alonso, for the advantage of allowing the subscriber to dynamically interact with it.

12. Claims 43-45, 47, 49, 50-54, 64-65, 68, and 83-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krapf and Armstrong in view of Butler (US 2002/0007493).

Claim 43 contains limitations of claim 31 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

Claim 43 additionally calls for:

The overlaid interface link being linked to ancillary content (See Krapf, col. 4, lines 4-15).

Displaying an overlaid interface link with the video based on the time elapsed during the display of the video.

However, Krapf and Armstrong fail to disclose displaying content based on the time elapsed during the display of the video.

In an analogous art, Butler teaches displaying content based on timing specifications for the advantage of indicating times for displaying content relative to the video stream – [0019].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Krapf and Armstrong's invention to include displaying content based on timing specifications, as taught by Butler, for the advantage of indicating times for displaying content relative to the video stream.

As for claim 44, Krapf discloses the display displays the streaming video distributed over the network— col. 3, lines 65-67, col. 4, lines 1-3, col. 6, lines 16-18.

As for claims 45, Krapf discloses wherein the interface link (web location) is hidden from view until the viewer selects the image, resulting in invoking a linked URL which leads to a web location which provides information related to the image – col. 3, lines 43-56.

As for claim 47, Krapf discloses wherein different entities in a frame may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to the particular web page (primary ancillary content) when the image is selected. The user browses the particular web page which has links on it and then further accesses a link on the web page by selecting it. The link takes the user to a secondary web page (second ancillary content) which allows the user to access additional desired information– col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claim 49, Armstrong discloses wherein the user may buy (commercial transaction) a dealer's product through the web page for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product through his TV set – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claim 50, Krapf discloses wherein the user may purchase good or services. As this is possible, the system inherently has a link to a site adapted to transact the commercial transaction for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor – col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claim 51, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including information relating to the video. The alternative subject matter data is associated with the program of the channel - col. 6, lines 39-42.

As for claim 52, Krapf discloses wherein said interacting step includes accessing ancillary content including video. The streaming video data includes the alternative subject matter (ancillary content) - col. 6, lines 36-40. The alternative subject matter is saved as compressed video - col. 7, lines 4-9.

As for claim 53, Krapf discloses the user may purchase a product using the ancillary content for the advantage of allowing the process of buying a product from a vendor - col. 12, lines 39-45.

As for claim 54, Krapf discloses the video may be associated with different URLs, and may serve to direct the user to a plurality of web sites - col. 4, lines 4-14.

As for claim 64, Butler teaches the step of measuring includes interacting with a time code marker embedded in the video - [0019].

As for claim 65, Kikinis and Armstrong fail to disclose embedding a time code marker in the video to permit the display of an interface link to the ancillary content based on the time elapsed during the display of the video.

In an analogous art, Butler teaches embedding a time code marker (timing specification) in the video to permit the display of an interface link (hyperlink overlay) to the ancillary content (supplemental content) based on the time elapsed during the display of the video – [0019], [0021].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify Kikinis and Armstrong's invention to include the above mentioned limitation, as taught by Butler, for the advantage of displaying supplemental content at the appropriate time.

Claim 68 contains the limitations of claim 43 and is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to those claims.

As for claim 83, Krapf teaches wherein the network supports two-way communication (col. 4, lines 10-15).

As for claim 84, Krapf teaches wherein the network is an internet protocol based network (col. 1, lines 21-22, col. 8, lines 39-41).

As for claims 85-86, Krapf teaches wherein the remote location includes an endpoint server which includes a web server and content database (col. 6, lines 8-38, col. 8, lines 38-42).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-8567. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

/Sumaiya A Chowdhury/
Examiner, Art Unit 2421